COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 19.] LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 13, 1809. [Price 1s.

"Do you think it possible to get me a vote on Monday; for Pitt's motion?"
MRS. CLARKE'S *Letter to Capt.* SANDON.

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

AUSTRIA.——The reader will, perhaps, remember, that, when the present war between Austria and France was first talked of, I endeavoured to convince the ministerial writers, that their *joy* at the prospect of such a war would speedily be turned into mourning; and that, by their exertions to urge Austria on to war, they were, supposing their exertions to have any effect, urging her on to her destruction. The editor of the Morning Chronicle made similar observations, and for so doing he was most severely censured by his party opponents, who, according to their old manner of turning every thing to a party account, accused his friends of wishing to see Buonaparté master of the continent, and who failed not to hold themselves forth as the real friends of the "*liberties*," as they termed it, of Europe.——The recently received intelligence must, one would suppose, have convinced these *Anti-Jacobins*, that we were right, and that they were wrong. But, it is no matter whether they be so convinced, or not. Their *readers*, indeed, one would desire to see undeceived; yet, perhaps, it may, since deception has been carried on so long, be full as well to leave the work of removing that deception to *time* and *events*.——The fate of Austria will do little, perhaps, in the way of *warning* to despotic governments. They have already had so many warnings, that, it really seems, that they are doomed to destruction. Talk of *armies*, indeed! What has this famous army of Austria done? Suppose the French to have made only *thirty* thousand prisoners: I believe, that they have made all they say they have made; but, suppose it to be only thirty thousand; how are thirty thousand men to be made prisoners, in an open country, *against their will?* There is no such thing. It cannot be. Why, that must occupy a length of line of *six or seven miles*. What can *surround* six or seven miles? Only consider how many men it must take to surround a line of six or seven miles long. The Austrians were the first in the field; they had chosen their ground; nor is it to be believed, that they had neglected to secure the means of covering their retreat. Yet, down they fall like so many men made of paste-board. No, no: it is evident, that they had no stomach for the fight; and, when that is the case, numbers, and what is called discipline, are of no avail. —— Some persons expressed great admiration of the Archduke's Proclamations upon entering Germany; his complaints against the ambition of Napoleon, and his protestations about the Emperor of Austria's desire to preserve peace. Alas! these were known well enough before. But, in these what interest had the *people* of Germany? Aye, or the *people* of Austria? The question with them was: "shall *we* be worse off under the Emperor "Napoleon than under the Emperor "Francis?" This was the question, and the only rational question, with them. Intriguing courtiers, sinecure placemen and meritless pensioners; all those who live in idleness upon the fruit of the public labour, may and will abuse the people for this indifference; but, if they would give themselves time to consider, they would see the unreasonableness of all such abuse. They themselves are anxious for the preservation of their several old governments; and this is very natural, because, to them, those governments operate to great advantage; they live easy and comfortable lives under those governments; they, without any labour or care or talent, are getting rich under those governments; but, upon the very same principle that they are so anxious for the preservation of such governments, the people, out of whose property and labour they enrich themselves, must be indifferent to the fate of those governments; or, rather, they must wish for a change, without troubling themselves with nice calculations as to the good or the evil, which that change is calculated to produce.—— Here is the real cause of all the triumphs of Napoleon. We hear stories about his carrying *millions of pieces of gold* with him, wherewith to corrupt the Austrian officers; a fact, if true, that seems to be a pretty

good answer to those, who talk about the *poverty* of the French government, *owing to the loss of commerce*, and also to those, who would persuade us of the virtue of the Austrians; but, this is a mere invention; a falshood hatched for the purpose of misleading us; for, how is it *possible* for us to have any knowledge of such a fact. No; bribery, in this case, was, I am persuaded, unnecessary. He met, and he well knew that he should meet, with nothing like *a spirit* of resistance. The body of an army he knew he should have to meet; but, of the body without a soul he was not at all afraid.——These truths have long been very clear to all men of tolerably accurate information as to such matters; and, it is surprizing to see with what industry and pertinacity they are disguised from the mass of the people of this country. It is surprizing, because one can see no adequate reason for it. Why should not the people be told the truth, relative to the cause of Napoleon's success in other countries? Why not tell them, what we know to be true, that he triumphs because the people of the countries, against which he makes war, are indifferent as to whether he becomes their ruler, or not?——As to the effect, upon the general interests of Europe, which the apparent approaching fall of Austria will have, it is difficult to offer a decided opinion. With respect to *our own* interests, the change, whatever it may be, does not appear to me to be an object of dread. I do not see how it is to affect us any more than a revolution in Kamschatka would. We are now, and long have been, cut off from all connection with Austria. The only interest that we can reasonably feel, with respect to her, is, for the happiness of her people. I am far from being certain, that the total conquest of Austria might not, by diverting, in part, the attention and the force of Napoleon; by extending his dominion, multiplying the objects of his care, and, of course, dividing his means, operate, for sometime, at least, in favour of England; while, in another point of view, which is too evident to dwell upon, the advantage to us is certain. —— Having finished his work on the side of Germany, he will, indeed, be enabled to turn his whole force *upon Spain and Portugal*; and hence, in time, there must arise danger to this country, and particularly *to Ireland*, unless something efficacious be speedily adopted to render Ireland more secure internally than it now is. But, this would have happened, and *sooner* too, if Napoleon had *not* renewed the war with Austria. —— In short, viewing the matter in whatever way I will, I cannot, as an Englishman, discover any grounds for deciding, that the late triumph of France over Austria ought to be a subject of very deep regret. I do not like to see Napoleon triumph, *because he is a despot;* I wish the triumph had settled upon another head; upon the head of a different sort of man; but, I do not, and cannot, see that the triumph itself is calculated to produce any mischievous effect.——There is one argument in favour of Austria's going to war, which, even after the hitherto fatal consequences are known, is still persisted in, and which is too curious to be passed over unnoticed. It is this: that Napoleon had resolved, and had the power, to destroy Austria, whether she went to war, or not; and that, therefore, she might as well make a trial to save herself; she might as well take her chance of the consequences of a war. Supposing the premises to be true, the conclusion is certainly correct; and, if those who make use of the argument, will but be so good as to apply it to the case of an oppressed people, I think they will soon cease to be surprized at the indifference of such a people, and at their readiness to take the *chances of a change*. But, is it not shocking to hear it coolly asserted, that Napoleon, or that any prince, has *resolved* upon conquering a nation, which contains from twelve to twenty millions of people; and that it is wise for the sovereign of such nation to rush into a war, in order to obtain *a chance* of escaping being conquered? Why, does not this assertion amount to a confession, that the *people* of such nation are of no weight at all; that they take no interest in the matter; or, that they, at bottom, wish for the success of Napoleon? What should have given him such confidence with respect to the conquest of Austria? The answer is ready: he knew, or, at least, he had very good reason for believing, that the twenty millions of people, living in the Austrian dominions, were not disposed to resist him. ——*Party*, as usual, has laid hold of this defeat of the Austrians, to call for a *change of ministry in England*. Good Lord! As if that would alter the case; as if that would make either the people or the army of Austria more disposed to a resistance of the French! The shape, in which this argument assails the common sense of the country, is this: that the defeat of the Austrians will add to the means, which Napoleon has of injuring us; that we shall

stand in need of more wise and vigorous councils than we now have, in order to enable us to resist this increase of means in the hands of our enemy; that the late ministers are more wise and vigorous than the present; and that, therefore, the present ought to be turned out and the late restored to power. As I do not agree in *any one* of the premises, I, of course, reject the conclusion; and, I firmly believe, that a change of ministry, at this time, would be *greatly injurious* to the country. There would be new lords to make; and, which is much worse, there would be a new batch of pensioners to be fastened upon the public. The feelings and views of both *parties*, towards the people, is evidently the same. There is no difference whatever; and, in point of diligence and ability, the present men are, upon an average, I verily believe, quite equal to their predecessors. It was not, even in the affair of Spain, *ability* that was wanting. It was a want of right principles; the losses and disgrace, arising from our interference in the southern Peninsula of Europe, are to be ascribed, not to a want of ability in the ministers, but to that vicious system, which affects our foreign as well as our domestic concerns, and to which system the late ministers are shewn clearly to the whole nation, that they are full as much attached as the present.

MR. MADOCKS'S MOTION.——On the 4th instant Mr. Madocks made a motion, in the House of Commons, for taking an examination *at the bar of the House*, upon the subject of a charge which he had to make against MR. PERCEVAL and LORD CASTLEREAGH, relating to the *disposing of a seat in that House*. This motion was negatived upon the ground of its not being sufficiently specific; and, as it will be brought forward in another shape, I shall not now offer any remarks upon the alleged fact itself. Indeed, the charge will have been made according to the taste of the parties themselves, before this sheet can issue from the press.——There was, however, something said, during the debate, respecting the proceedings at *Public Meetings*, which is well worthy of the attention of every reader.——It seems odd, at first sight, that the conduct of the Meetings of the People, in the several counties and towns of the kingdom, should have formed any part of the topics, on this occasion, when so heavy a charge, as that of having been guilty of corruption, was preferred against two of the King's ministers; but, we remember the cry of *Jacobinism*; the cry of a *Jacobin Conspiracy*, when Mr. Wardle preferred his charges against the Duke of York; and, remembering this, our surprize upon the present occasion will naturally be the less. But, let us now hear what was said about those Meetings, which the people have held for the purpose of thanking the man, whom the ministers declared they would not suffer, *without opposition*, to receive the thanks of the House of Commons. Let us hear what was said about these Meetings.——MR. BRAGGE, according to the report of the debate, was the first. He is stated to have said, that, "he conceived there was some-"thing extremely irregular in the form of "proceeding proposed by the Hon. Mem-"ber. It was a form of proceeding better "adapted to the genius and spirit of one "of the Meetings *that were so frequent, and* "*so industriously promoted*, than befitting "the temper and *dignity* of that House. "It would well become that Meeting, *in* "*which the extraordinary proposition was* "*made and approved, that a man holding a* "*place under Government was not fit to sit* "*in that House*. Such propositions were "not intended for the sober consideration "of Parliament. No; their object was "to increase the popular ferment, to add "fuel to fire; and to encourage and pro-"pagate that dangerous spirit that was "circulated with a diligence the most sus-"picious. 'Spargere voces in vulgus am-"biguas.'—seemed to be the grand princi-"ple of action of the leaders of these "Meetings. Their aim was *to cry down* "*all public men—to render them objects of* "*distrust and suspicion.*"——Now, in the first place, it will be observed, that MR. MADOCKS distinctly stated, that he had *proofs* whereon to ground his charge, and, that as to *ambiguity*, he not only stated *the offence*, but *named* the alledged offenders. What ambiguity was here? Was not this quite "*tangible*" enough? Was this a mere slanderous insinuation, calculated for the purpose of exciting distrust and *suspicion*? On the contrary, did not Mr. Madocks, like Mr. Wardle, expose himself to the consequences of a failure in making good his charges? What could be fairer? Besides, Mr. Madocks was ready to name the *other* particulars of the case; so that this charge of ambiguity seems to have been the last that could attach to him.——As to the contrast, which Mr. Bragge was pleased to draw between the genius and spirit of the Public Meetings and the dignity of the House, has the reader seen, at any of the Meetings, any thing like popu-

lar fury or folly? Does Mr. GEORGE ROSE discover any thing of this sort in the admirable Resolutions, passed in the town of *Southampton*, the electors of which have expressed their disapprobation of the parliamentary conduct of his son; or, in those of *Christchurch*, where he himself has met with something similar? *He* may; but, the nation will not. The truth is, that the Meetings, upon the present occasion, are without example for their *temper*, as well as their respectability; and, whatever may be said about them in the House of Commons, their utility can no more be doubted than their legality.——As to the "*extraordinary* proposition," that *a man holding a place under government was not fit to sit in the House of Commons*, we will first hear Mr. STURGES, upon the same point, and then we will see how the fact stands. He, in the report of the debate, is stated to have said, that "he was proud that he "was no party to such resolutions as "those lately published, stating a clause "in the Act of Settlement *as the existing* "*law* of the land, *which never was law.* "(Here it was observed that *it was four* "*years before it was repealed.*) Never till "lately had it been seen in this country, "that bodies of people, *not present during* "*a judicial examination*, had met to arraign "the conduct of those who found it *their* "*duty* to acquit one who was accused. "He never till now heard of condemning "the Commons in this manner, for the "exercise of *their duty* in an acquittal. He "could not conceive how those who "called themselves the friends of the "country could reconcile it to their feel-"ings to *degrade the character* of the House "of Commons."———Here is new matter, and we will dismiss that first. We are told, that it is something new for persons *not present* at an examination, to arraign the conduct of those who have found it *their duty* to acquit the accused. But, Mr. Sturges, Mr. Sturges, do you not perceive, that there has been *something new* in this whole affair? That there was something new in crying out Jacobin Conspiracy, when a member simply preferred specific charges against a person in the public employ and in the public pay? That there was something new in not permitting the accuser to follow the mode of investigation that he proposed? That there was something new in denouncing, before hand, infamy upon the head of that accuser, in case he should fail to make good his charges? That there was something new in the House being, before it met to decide upon the case, told by the accused, that, *unless they acquitted him*, they ought not to decide at all? That there was *something new*, very new indeed, in all this, and in a good deal more that passed upon this memorable occasion; and, therefore, I do think, Mr. Sturges, that you might pass over without surprize, a little novelty in the proceedings at the Meetings. But, Sir, you seem totally to have forgotten one thing, and that is, that, owing to the mode of examination which was chosen by the Duke of York's *friends*, his excellently good and wise friends, *the whole of the Evidence* was before the public, and that, of course, bating the difference in point of *general understanding*, the public was full as able to decide rightly as those persons were, who were present during the examinations. The public had before them all the Evidence, printed by order of the House itself. What could it have more? And, as to censuring an "*acquit-*"*tal*," why not censure that as well as a condemnation, if they thought it was wrong? In short, if the people have a right to meet, and to express their sentiments relative to the conduct of the House of Commons; if they have a right to do this in any case, the right will serve them in this case as well as in any other; unless, indeed, it should be contended, that the glorious constitution, for which they are called upon "to spend their last "shilling and to shed the last drop of "their blood," allows them to meet only for the purpose of *praising* the conduct of the parliament.——Now, as to what Mr. Bragge called the "*Extraordinary* Propo-"sition." There, surely, is something very reasonable in the proposition, that those who are appointed to be the *guardians of the public money should not be allowed to take any of that money themselves*; that they should not be allowed to take it from any quarter, or through any channel, and especially through the Crown, as a check upon which the constitution considers them. This appears to be very reasonable; and yet Mr. Sturges said that he was *proud* that he was no party to a resolution, containing such a proposition. Nay, he is reported to have said that it *never was law.* He was, it appears, contradicted at the time; but I will make the contradiction in a manner a little more formal. The second act, passed in the twelfth year of the reign of WILLIAM III, contains this clause: "That no person, who has "an *office*, or place of profit, under the "king, or receives a pension from the

" crown, shall be capable of serving as a " member of the House of Commons." This clause was, in part, repealed in the 4th year of the reign of Queen Anne, and in part since. It is *no longer* law, I know very well; but, does that circumstance render it absurd? This act of parliament it was, which placed the crown upon the heads of the king's family. This is no common act of parliament. It is one of the great *constitutional laws.* It changed the dynasty of the kingdom; and, it was made for the express purpose of " further " limiting the crown, and *better securing the* " *rights and liberties of the subject.*"——— Now, Mr. Sturges, will you tell me, that this law, like the act for a toll-gate, may be repealed at pleasure, and ought not to be so much dwelt upon, as if its provisions were unchangeable? Will you tell me this, Sir?. Well, then, why did you and your party appeal to it; appeal to this very law against the prayers of the Roman Catholics, and tell us, that if the king consented to those prayers, he would violate the act which placed him upon the throne?——Pray answer that, Sir? ———At that time, we heard a great deal about *the principles* which placed the family of Brunswick upon the throne. True, it was one of those principles, that the Roman Catholic religion should not be suffered to predominate; but, the prohibition contained in the clause I have cited above was not less one of those principles, and, give me leave to add, that it was a principle of *much greater importance to the nation.* And yet you (a lawyer, I believe) tell us, that it " *never was law!*" What would you say, Sir, to any one who should assert, that the family of Brunswick came to the crown without law? Yet, it was that very act of parliament, of which this clause forms a part, that gave them, as all the world knows, their title to the crown. Queen Anne's brother was the heir to the crown, she leaving no child; but, the nation, fearing that this brother would, like his father, violate their rights and liberties, passed an act transferring the right of succession from the House of Stuart to the House of Brunswick; and this, which I have quoted from, was that act. And you are reported to have said, that the part which I have quoted " *never* " *was law;*" and Mr. Bragge calls it an " *extraordinary* proposition."——That it was a most wise provision reason itself would have taught us, if experience, woeful experience, had not impressed it upon our minds. Had this provision always remained in force, we never should have had to thank Mr. Wardle for what he has done, because neither he nor any one else would have had it to do. Was it not striking; was it not, Sir, sufficient to strike the most stupid observer, that, against the Duke of York *not one* of the placemen or pensioners was found to vote?——But, if the principle, for which I contend, never was sanctioned by law; if it be so very absurd; why did not you, Sir, when you heard me maintain it, at the last nomination at Winchester, expose my ignorance and absurdity? You were present; you heard me; and why did you not, when the county was assembled to witness your exploit, put me down? Come, come; it will not do to say, that I was beneath your notice. That will not do any longer. The time for that is passed, and you will never see it return. People are now disposed to try things as well as men by the test of *truth;* and to no other test will they suffer an appeal. Calumny and out-cry have lost their power. If you put me down, therefore, you must do it by true facts or fair argument; and, if you remain silent, the conclusion will be in my favour.——Before I come to what was said as to the general disposition of the Meetings to excite *suspicions* against, and to make an *attack* upon, all public men, I must quote from the speech of another member, a gentleman, as it is given in the report, of the name of Gooch, who is stated to have said, " that if the speeches attributed to " particular persons were literally so, they " went near to destroy what was the most " desirable of all things in the present " state of the country; he meant the *una-* " *nimity of the public mind;* and tended to " more mischief than all their authors " could retrieve, if they lived to sit in the " House for an hundred years to come. " He would give his feeble assistance to " the prevention of real abuses, but not to " those *general attacks* of abuses, never " known as such till these *pure* days! " These public Meetings could only do " mischief. He did not impute improper " motives to individuals, but as to voting " public thanks to an Hon. Gent. for his pa- " triotism, he would as soon vote them to " Mrs. Clarke for her virtue. *(A laugh,* " *hear! hear!)* He would not be deterred " from his opinions by the sentiments of " any SET of people. The expressions he " had heard imputed to an Hon. Gent., " did him no credit as an Englishman. " He hoped always to see *respectable per-* " *sons opposing Government.* They were

"the guardians of the public interest; "but there was a power behind those "benches (the Opposition benches) greater "than those benches themselves. That "power looked not to Parliament, but to "a faction who would *get rid of all par-* "*ties.*" —— Now, taking these several points in their due order, how does Mr. Gooch make it out, that the speeches at public Meetings have tended to destroy the *unanimity* of the public mind. If ever there was, in the whole history of this country, a question upon which the people were *unanimous*, they are so upon the question relating to the Duke of York. How, then, have the speeches, which have been made for the purpose of inducing the people to express their sentiments upon the subject, tended "to *destroy* the unani- "mity of the public mind?" —— Mr. Gooch speaks ironically of "these *pure* "days;" but, so did not Mr. Perceval speak, when, as Attorney General, he prosecuted the poor, ignorant, HAMLIN, the Tin-man of Plymouth. He, *then*, talked, in good set terms, of the purity of the present times; and said, that it was due to the age and country, in which we had the honour to live, to declare, that there was no such thing as corruption amongst public men.——Nay, at this very time, there is a government prosecution going on against the office-sellers in the city, ordered by a ministry, of which Lord Castlereagh is still a member! So, really, I think that the friends of the ministers ought not to make a jest of the *purity* of the times.——Mr. Gooch would not give Mr. Wardle thanks for what he has done. Very well; and Mr. Canning said before hand, that he would oppose a vote of thanks to that gentleman, if it was proposed. That was very well too; but, the *nation* have felt and acted differently; they have thought that he deserved *their* thanks, though he might not deserve the thanks of the ministry or the regular Opposition. Their thanks they are giving him; and, I beg those who talk of the "*ferment* in the public mind;" who talk of "*popular* fury;" I beg them to observe, that these Meetings have been held by *grave corporate bodies* as well as by counties and in common-halls. And, I would beg to remind Mr. Sturges, that, at the county-meeting in Hampshire, all those, who spoke against the adoption of the Resolution, which was proposed by me, did, nevertheless, *decidedly approve of a* [illegible] *to Mr. Wardle*, not excepting [illegible] *Poulter*, who is well-known to be the constant eulogist of the present ministry, and who, at the Meeting, was, if possible, still louder and more decided than any other person in praise of Mr. Wardle, and told us that he came to the Meeting for the express purpose of giving to Mr. Wardle *his decided, his warm, his heart-felt thanks.* So that, as to this point, even the partizans of the ministers; their devoted partizans "out of doors," as it is called, differ from Mr. Gooch and Mr. Canning, for the loss of whose thanks Mr. Wardle will, probably, be able to console himself, when he reflects that that loss has gained him an expression of the thanks of the whole nation.——Mr. Gooch, like the two gentlemen before-named, complained of *general attacks* upon public men. Why, it was formerly the practice to complain of *personality.* That was the cant cry about a year or two ago. But, how does the fact stand as to these *general* attacks? The Duke of York was individually accused; Lord Castlereagh was so accused; and Mr. Perceval is now so accused, as we have seen, by Mr. Maddocks. What ground is there, then, for this complaint of *general attacks?* To be sure, there are very *general suspicions*, and, pray, was not Mr. Creevey's honest and bold declaration very well calculated to excite such suspicions; especially as no one was found to deny the charge made by that gentleman?——In answer to this complaint of Mr. Gooch, we have, I think, only to quote the speech of MR. CREEVEY and the answer of MR. PERCEVAL, of the 20th of last month; and, these may, too, serve as an answer to what the Gentleman said about the attempts to cry down *both parties*; for, we shall see, that according to the news-paper report of that memorable debate, the answer of Mr. Perceval did not contain any denial of the charge, but a *recrimination upon the late Ministry*; and, indeed, who can have forgotten, that several months of the last session of parliament were taken up in mutual accusations of the two parties; not that I complain of their time having been so employed, being convinced that their *falling out* had an excellent effect upon the nation, but, after that, I really think it a little hard that the *people* should be so abused for entertaining suspicions of both parties; or for making one general attack upon them. Surely the people may be allowed to think of both, that which each of them boldly says of the other.——But, let us hear Mr. Creevey and Mr. Perceval. —— "Mr. "Creevey said, that the Noble Lord was

" perfectly correct in stating, that seats in " Parliament had been notoriously bought " and sold by the Treasury. He would " say, that this was not only his belief, " *but that it was within his knowledge. The* " *Treasury not only openly bought and sold those* " *seats, but they kept in a great degree the mo-* " *nopoly of that market.* If this was at- " tempted to be denied by Ministers, *he* " *should be glad to have the opportunity of* " *proving it, and he could easily prove it from* " *the lips of any one who had ever been Secre-* " *tary of the Treasury.* It was absolute " nonsense and delusion on the public, for " the House to spend their time in consi- " dering abuses in the Commissioners of " the Lottery, and every other minor de- " partment, when they knew, and when " the public knew, that the greatest of all " abuses was constantly practised by every " Secretary of the Treasury, in buying " and selling seats in Parliament. To talk " of a dissolution of Parliament as an ap- " peal to the people was mere mockery " and imposition. It was perfectly well " known *that a dissolution of Parliament was* " *not an appeal to the people, but to the Trea-* " *sury (Hear! hear!)*—Although he had " great respect for the last government, " and owed some personal favours to them, " yet he must say, that their dissolution of " Parliament, at the end of four years, like " the dissolution by the present Ministers, " at the end of about four months, was " not an appeal to the people but to the " Treasury *(loud cries of Hear! hear!)*— " Until the House was disposed to sup- " press this odious and unconstitutional " traffic, the legislating on these minor " abuses was mere mockery and delu- " sion."——These are pretty round asser- tions. They cannot be misunderstood. The man must be an ideot, who does not understand them clearly. And yet, I am sure that Mr. Gooch will not deny, that the constitution, for which we are called upon, and *are ready*, to spend our last shil- ling and shed our last drop of blood, does not allow of this sort of traffic; but, on the contrary, distinctly forbids it, under heavy pains and penalties.——Well, then, what says the king's minister, Mr. Perce- val, to this? " MR. PERCEVAL said, that " the Noble Lord had stated his firm be- " lief of the existence of such transactions, " and the hon. gent. had gone further, and " stated, that it was within his absolute " knowledge. The hon. gent. to be sure, " *might have some knowledge, from the confi-* " *dence which was reposed in him by the late* " *Administration*, with whom he was con- " nected.—*(Loud cries of hear! hear!)*— " He could not recollect, however, that " the hon. gent. (Mr. Creevey) had, at the " time *when a specific charge was brought* " *against a Secretary of the Treasury for such* " *interference, given the House the benefit of* " *his knowledge.* The House would per- " ceive, that the case he alluded to was, " when a charge was brought against a " Secretary of the Treasury (Mr. Free- " mantle), *for interference in the election of* " *Hampshire*, where he was undoubtedly a " freeholder. The hon. gent. did not then " tell the House a word of that practice " which was within his own knowledge, of " Secretaries of the Treasury corruptly " interfering in the election of Members " of Parliament. When he had that " knowledge, how did it happen that his " patriotism was asleep on that remarkable " occasion?" —— Thus, you see, Mr. Gooch, here is no *denial* of the fact, but merely a charge against the late ministers of having done the same thing.——Well, then, Sir, can you complain of the people, that they entertain suspicions of, and that they attack, both parties? How, after this, can they *possibly* have any confidence in either? It is not in nature that they should! and, abuse them who will, they never will have confidence in either again. ——Mr. Gooch has, it seems, no objec- tion " to see *respectable* persons opposing the government; *they* are the *guardians* of the *public interest*;" but, he bitterly complains of a power behind the opposi- tion benches, greater than those benches themselves. Yes, yes; to be sure, an opposition; a *regular* opposition; this is quite necessary, absolutely necessary, to the support of the system; and, indeed it is notorious, that the parties like one another very well. Respectable persons, such for, instance, as Mr. *Sheridan*, Ge- neral *Fitzpatrick*, and Mr *Tierney*; these, it seems, may oppose as long and as loudly as they please; they are the " *guardians* of the *public interest*," though, when in power, their party did pension off *Mrs. Fox and her Daughters*; but, persons like Mr. Whitbread, Sir Francis Burdett, Lord Folkestone, Mr. Wardle, Mr. Lyttle- ton, Mr. Coke, Mr. Brand, Mr. Madocks, &c. &c. these " persons" must not at- tempt to oppose government; no, nor to express their opinions. It is odd enough, at first sight, that the ministerial party should be so very angry with these gen- tlemen, and particularly with Sir Fran- cis Burdett and Mr. Wardle, who have distinctly declared that they *do not wish*

for a change of Ministry; but, the reason is this: that these gentlemen wish to put an end to *regular* opposition, without which both parties well know, that there is neither "*indemnity* for the past nor *security* for the future."——I am quite surprized, that any man in his sober senses, should have conceived the idea of retrieving the reputation of parties. It is a thing as impossible as for him to raise the dead from the grave. Upon no point was the public mind ever more decidedly fixed, than upon this, that both parties are alike with respect to the people, and that it is not of the smallest consequence to the people which of them is in power.——To the speeches, which I have quoted from, there were most triumphant answers given by Mr. Biddulph, Mr. Whitbread, Mr. Brand, and especially by Mr. Lyttleton, who said, that "If the House adopted *a moderate and just reform*, he believed that the "public meetings would be fewer, and "less alarming to the Government. They "*were the natural consequences of the misconduct of the House, and there was no prevention of them by absolute force, but by timely Reform.* As for misrepresentations "of the press, which were complained of "by Gentlemen opposite, had not others, "and *particularly an Hon. Baronet*, been "treated to the full, with as little ceremony? He could not believe that the nation "would impute to the advocates of Reform "what the press imputed to them. Indeed such reports of public meetings "would be trampled upon, *if the grievances themselves did not actually exist.* He concluded by declaring his opinion, that the "Ministers of the Crown possessed an undue influence in that House."——I could wish to insert the whole of Mr. Whitbread's Speech, but want of room prevents me. Those parts, however, which relate to *Public Meetings* and to *Reform*, I cannot refrain from inserting.——He said that "a right hon. gent. had thought proper to make some remarks upon gentlemens' attending certain clubs and societies existing for the purpose, as he supposed, of exciting the public mind and "inflaming popular passion. What had, "in fact, excited the public mind? *What, but the results of recent investigations into transactions of public importance!* What, "*but the refusal of the House of Commons to do justice on a Member and a Minister who did not deny his offences.* What, "without imputing such a design to Ministers, would be the consequence of an "*attempt to stifle the expression of the public voice?* . . . . . .

". . . . When a cry was raised against "public Meetings, because two Ministers "were charged with corruption, he felt "desirous to ask the Chancellor of the "Exchequer a few questions, with respect "to the means of inflaming the public "mind. Was it meant to say that the few "persons who were at the recent Meeting "could be so *extremely dangerous? Was it "true or not that gross corruptions existed?* "He would admit not so gross as in former times, but yet gross enough. Were "we so purified? *Had we really done "enough in the progress of Reform?* No, we "could never do enough; if the work of "Reform ceased, while human nature was "human nature, corruption would succeed and triumph. . . . . .

". . . . . Corrupt conduct "was imputed to Mr. Spencer Perceval "and Lord Castlereagh. The responsibility was on the mover, and let the "House decide fairly; the withdrawing "the motion might carry the appearance "of mistake in the mover. It might have "been more prudent to consult the opinion of the Chair; but the motion being made, he thought the principle of "the right ought not to be yielded. This "was an attack, *not on all public men, but on their corrupt practices*; and if defeated in "the question now, he hoped it would be "brought on again almost immediately. "They all knew of these practices, and "they had recognized them. *The House "of Commons had passed over a case placed "before them, and the man remained a Minister of State.* Does not that transaction "shew *that abuse is not corrected or checked?* "and those men who do not wish for a "Parliamentary Reform should look well "to the remedy of what is practically "wrong, and for which Members might "be sent to Newgate. A Member offers "to prove the existence of Ministerial "corruption, and up jumps some honourable Gentleman, *and charges him with attacking all public characters, and endeavouring to destroy the Constitution from the "foundation, and to build up some new edifice.* He denied again the truth of such "charges. He saw no proof or just suspicion of such a system as was alluded "to. If the House would not give the people the right of public investigation into "abuses, the people may be contented and "quiet; but they would see, that they who "refused enquiry, refused to them the British Constitution."——The case is so clear, that no man can err in deciding upon it. The

cause of the Meetings is to be found *solely* in the existence, the known and acknowledged existence, of abuses, which are so injurious to the people, and the pecuniary pressure and constant difficulties and embarrassments arising from which, are so severely felt. This is the sole cause of the Public Meetings. Nor were the people hasty about it. They waited with great patience to see what the House of Commons would do. But, when they saw a committee of the House sending down *proof*, that a minister of state and a member of the House had been guilty of offering a place of profit to be given for a seat in that House, was it not time for the people to speak their sentiments touching the necessity of a Reform of parliament? And, when they afterwards saw a motion for censuring this member negatived, and the member still keeping his seat and holding his office as a great minister of state, were they still to be silent? Or, if they complained of this, were they to be represented as *anarchists;* as men bent upon the overthrow of the *Constitution?*—— The House of Commons, by chearfully voting to Mr. Wardle those thanks which he so well deserved, would have prevented any Public Meetings for that purpose; and by now making such a Reform as the necessity of the case so clearly points out, they would prevent future Meetings for that purpose. But, until the people have this Reform, or see the House disposed to make it, they will meet, unless they be prevented, as Mr. Whitbread said, by force; and, in the end, that mode of prevention must be unavailing.

Mr. Curwen's Motion.——There will, hereafter, be opportunities enough for discussing this question; but, I cannot, even now, refrain from observing, that, if the motion be adopted, I do not see how it can produce any real good. To impose *oaths* upon men *disposed to act corruptly* appears to me to be doing nothing at all. There is no such thing as a minister of state's selling or buying a seat in parliament, even now, without a breach of oath. There would need no oaths at all, if the system of representation was such as to give the voice of election to a sufficient portion of the *property* of the country, and if care was taken to see that the pecuniary qualifications of members were *real* and were to a sufficient amount. There have been instances of men obtaining seats in parliament, in *former times*, at least, in order to screen their bodies from the seizure of a bailiff, and, in fact, in order to cheat their creditors. Is not this notorious? Well, then, does Mr. Curwen believe; can he possibly believe, that such men would be at all checked by any *oath* that he could devise? Nay, if there were a member, who would give his vote for the sake of getting, or of keeping, a place or a pension, can Mr. Curwen hope, that such a wretch would regard an *oath?* Oh, no! Oaths are made to bind honest men; and an oath of the sort proposed might keep some such out of the House, but not a single rogue, not a single hunter after place or pension; not a single man who would be liable to make use of his seat to the public injury.——What is wanted is precisely that which would render oaths unnecessary.——I do not see any great objection to five or six of the principal servants of the King, who have, every day, statements to make to the House, having seats in it, though I cannot see the *necessity* of it; but, is it not contrary to all principles of sound reason, that there should be amongst those, whom the constitution considers as a *check* upon the Crown, so large a portion who actually receive the people's money from that Crown, which money they themselves first vote? We, who wish for a Reform, are charged with desiring to *degrade* the House of Commons, when the fact is, that we desire to elevate the character as well of the *electors* as of the *elected*. We wish for nothing new; we wish to recur to the old principles of the constitution, which, indeed, are the dictates of common sense, that *property* should again, as it formerly was, be the basis of *representation;* or, in other words, that those who have interests to manage, should have the choice of the managers. The great alteration, which time has produced, may call for some regulation by which *trade* and *profession* shall be admitted to share with property in land; but still the principle is the same; and, my opinion is, that, unless that principle be acted upon, there will be no Reform worth the paper upon which the act shall be printed.——*Universal suffrage*, though very fair in theory, is good for nothing in practice. They have tried this in America, and the consequence is, that the representatives are pretty much like the worst and most numerous part of the electors, except in the cities, where the whole of the people have an opportunity of being well-informed. The truth is, that there is the same sort of likeness between our present system and that of universal suffrage that exists between Popery and Me-

thodism; and our electors, those who have the nominal choosing of the far greater part of the members, are of exactly the same description as the most numerous part of the electors in America. ——There is nothing to alarm; nothing to disturb; nothing to confuse; nothing to obstruct the government, in any one of its functions; there is nothing of this to be apprehended from such a Reform as I have been speaking of; but, on the contrary, every thing to tranquillize the minds of the people; to inspire respect for, and confidence in, the parliament; and to insure, against the attempts of all their enemies, durability to all the establishments of the kingdom.——But, as to an *oath!* what is an oath? An oath tendered to those, who are disposed to be dishonest? I really cannot, in spite of all my respect for Mr. Curwen, help expressing my surprize that any friend of his country should have thought of it.

Mr. H. Martyn's motion about *places and pensions* I have not time to notice at any length. Another opportunity will offer. But, it is quite good to see, that *Mr. Perceval* seems to agree, that there is much of waste and abuse in this way; a thing that he does not appear to have seen before. Oh! this Mr. Wardle is a wonder-working man! And, are we still to be told, that he does not merit our thanks. ——*My* labours, too, in this way, have, it seems, been right, notwithstanding all the abuse, which has been heaped upon them? ——I, for years, complained of the sale of places under the government. An act is now passing for the avowed purpose of preventing such practices; and yet the hirelings continue to assault me as a jacobin, who wishes to *overturn the government.* ——One must not mind this. One must keep on; never caring what they write or what they say. The country itself is so good, and there are so many good people in it, that one must not be disgusted into supineness by the abuse of the corrupt, the venal, and the ignorant.——When I am accused of democratical principles, I console myself by reflecting, that *Dr. O'Meara* obtained, through the means of Mrs. Clarke, the occasion of preaching before the king *a sermon against democratical principles;* and that his worthy fellow-labourer, *John Bowles,* was the first man that moulded Anti Jacobinism into a trade.

Botley, 11th May, 1809.

It is with great pleasure, that I see a Meeting of the *County of Wilts* advertised for the 17th instant, the requisition to the Sheriff being signed by *ninety-two* Freeholders and other Landholders.——This is the manner in which such things ought to be done.——It shows, that the people take an interest in public matters. There is nothing of party in it. The voice of a set of men aiming at the possession of power and emolument does not go forth to the world as the voice of a county.

My intention of inserting, at full length, all the Resolutions, &c. passed at the several Meetings, will, I am afraid, be frustrated by the numerousness of them. At any rate, I will insert a *List* of them; and, if any County or Place should be omitted, I shall be obliged to any gentleman, who will take the trouble to inform me of such omission.

I have great satisfaction, that the editors of the *Portsmouth Telegraph,* of the *Oxford University and City Herald,* and of *Bell's Weekly Messenger,* have intimated to me their readiness to insert the letters, which I purpose to address *to the People of Hampshire,* and which letters will be principally upon the subject of *Parliamentary Reform.* ——Letter I. which appeared in the last Register, will be published in the Portsmouth Telegraph.——If any other County, or Weekly Paper, shall choose to publish these letters, I will take care to have copies forwarded to them in time. The editors have only to signify their wish by letter, addressed *to Mr. Wright, No. 5, Panton Square, London.*——If any of these gentlemen shall differ from me in opinion, they will, of course, state it to their readers. All that I am anxious about is the triumph of truth; and, in order to secure that triumph, we need nothing but open and free discussion.——I look upon it as a very great compliment from those who have thus expressed their readiness to insert my observations; and I shall esteem it not the less so, if it should appear that these gentlemen do not agree with me in opinion.

N. B. Owing to a mistake in the printer or the copyist, the Resolution, passed at the *Hampshire* Meeting, thanking those who signed the requisition, the *Sixty-nine* were omitted, leaving nobody to be thanked but Mr. Powlett and myself. I am sure, that no one will suppose that this omission was intentional, and, therefore, I merely state the omission.

PROCEEDINGS

In Counties, Cities, Boroughs, *&c. relative to the recent* Inquiry *in the House*

of Commons, respecting the Conduct of the DUKE OF YORK. *(Continued from p.704.)*

COUNTY OF BERKS.

At a Meeting of the Freeholders and other Inhabitants of the County of Berks, held, at the Town Hall in Reading, in the same County, on Monday, the 17th day of April, 1809, convened by the High Sheriff, in pursuance of a Requisition addressed to him for that purpose.

Resolved, 1. That the recent Investigation into the Conduct of the Commander in Chief, and the result of other late Inquiries, fully satisfy this Meeting of the existence of the most scandalous Abuses in the several Departments of the Executive Government of the Country.

2. That Gwyllim Lloyd Wardle, esq. by his unexampled courage, ability and perseverance in the Inquiry into the Conduct of the Duke of York, has faithfully discharged his duty as a Member of Parliament, and has in a high degree merited the Thanks and Approbation of his Country.

3. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to sir Fras. Burdett, who seconded Mr. Wardle's Motion; to lord viscount Folkestone, for the active, uniform and able support which he afforded to Mr. Wardle during the whole of the above Inquiry; to Charles Shaw Lefevre, William Lewis Hughes, and George Knapp, esqrs. (Members representing Boroughs within this County); and to the remainder of the 125 Members who divided with Mr. Wardle on his Motion for an Address to his Majesty—in full confidence that they will persevere in the investigation and reform of abuses, till corruption be fully rooted out, and the people have the satisfaction of knowing that the sacrifices they make for the public good are not perverted to base and improper purposes.

4. That this Meeting is convinced, that the abuses which we lament would not so long have existed, without that culpable negligence and dereliction of duty which the late Majorities in the House of Commons have evinced.

5. That in order to secure in future a due vigilance and attention to the rights and interests of the people, so essential to the welfare of a free Government, it is requisite that the duration of Parliaments should be shortened, and that no Parliament should have any continuance longer than for three years, as enacted by a law passed in the reign of king William the Third.

6. That George Vansittart, esq. Representative of this County, has by his conduct on the late Inquiry, proved himself unworthy of the confidence of his Constituents.

7. That the conduct of Charles Dundas, esq. Representative of this County, on the late Inquiry, has not in this instance met with the approbation of his Constituents.

8. That from the part which Ministers have taken on the late Inquiry, no hope can be reasonably entertained of any effectual reformation of evils so generally and loudly complained of, until the Executive Department of the State shall be entrusted to men, who will honestly endeavour to detect, not shield abuses, and to whom the people may look up as the avengers, not the abettors of corruption.

9. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to sir John Throckmorton, bart. William Hallet, esq. and the other Gentlemen who have brought forward these Resolutions, and for their able support of the same.

TOWN OF NORTHAMPTON.

The Mayor having declined to accede to a Requisition, signed by seventeen respectable Householders, to call a Meeting of the Inhabitants of this Town, to take into consideration the propriety of Thanking Gwyllim Lloyd Wardle, esq., M. P. for his recent patriotic exertions in Parliament respecting the conduct of the late Commander in Chief, a numerous and respectable Meeting of the Inhabitants was held April 17th, pursuant to public advertisement, at the Angel Inn, when, for want of room, the company adjourned to the Yard, and the following Resolutions were then proposed and agreed to, viz.

1. Resolved unanimously,—That the sincere and cordial Thanks of this Meeting be given to G. L. Wardle, esq., M. P. for Oakhampton, in the county of Devon, for his manly, independent and patriotic exertions, in instituting and conducting the Charges against the late Commander in Chief.

2. Resolved unanimously,—That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to sir Francis Burdett, bart., for having seconded the Motion of Mr. Wardle.

3. Resolved unanimously,—That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to lord visc. Althorp, one of the Representatives of this County, for his public-spirited conduct during the late Investigation, and particularly for his Constitutional Speech with which he prefaced the Amendment to Mr. Bragge Bathurst's Motion.

4. Resolved unanimously,—That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to the 125 Independent Members, who decided in favour of Mr. Wardle's Motion for an Address to the King on the subject of the late Inquiry.

5. Resolved (with only six dissentients),—That it is the opinion of this Meeting, that the gross and scandalous Abuses that have recently been exposed and detected, call loudly for Constitutional Redress and Correction as the only means left to convince the People, that the heavy Sacrifices they are called upon to make are not perverted to base and improper purposes.

6. Resolved unanimously,—That the Proceedings of this Meeting be signed by the Chairman, and that copies thereof be sent to G. L. Wardle, esq.; sir Francis Burdett, bart.; and lord visc. Althorp; and that the same be published in the Northampton Mercury, the County Press, the Morning Chronicle, the Courier, and the Star newspapers.

BOROUGH OF DERBY.

At a General Meeting of the Inhabitants of the Borough of Derby, at the Town Hall, on the 18th April, convened by the Mayor, pursuant to a Requisition, "to consider the propriety of returning "Thanks to Gwyllim Lloyd Wardle, esq., "for having instituted and prosecuted "the late Inquiry into the Conduct of his "Royal Highness the Duke of York," H. BROWNE, esq., Mayor, in the Chair, The following Resolutions were almost unanimously adopted, viz.

That this Meeting, actuated by the purest motives, is desirous of expressing to G. L. Wardle, esq., its grateful Thanks for the firm and independent manner in which, unconnected with party, he instituted, and the temper and perseverance which he displayed, in the prosecution of the late arduous Inquiry into the Conduct of his Royal Highness the Duke of York.

That this Meeting, believing that gross abuses and shameful corruption have been fully proved to exist in various departments of the State, and in the general administration of public affairs, is thoroughly convinced of the necessity of timely and temperate, but strict and effectual inquiry and correction.

That after the distinguished proof which has been given by Mr. Wardle, of what under the forms of our excellent Constitution may be accomplished by the honest exertions of an individual Member of the House of Commons, this Meeting trusts that the fatal consequences to which such corruption and abuse must inevitably lead, will be averted by the united efforts of all good men, and of such Representatives of the People in particular, as with abilities equal to the task, shall have the courage, probity, and independence, to step forwards on an occasion so pregnant with honour to themselves and safety to their country.

That a Copy of these Resolutions be signed by the Chairman, and transmitted by him to G. L. Wardle, esq.

BOROUGH OF LEWES.

At a Meeting of the Inhabitants of the said Borough, holden at the Town Hall, in Lewes, on Tuesday the 18th day of April, 1809, in conformity to a Requisition signed by a great number of the Inhabitants,—Mr. HENRY PAWSON, Senior Constable, in the Chair,

Resolved unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to G. L. Wardle, esq., for his patriotic and firm conduct in preferring and prosecuting certain Charges of corrupt practices against his Royal Highness the Duke of York, in his Office of Commander in Chief.

Resolved unanimously, That in the opinion of this Meeting the evidence adduced before the House of Commons, fully proved abuses to have existed with the knowledge of his Royal Highness, to the great detriment of the Army, and which must, if persevered in, have been ultimately injurious to the best and dearest interests of the nation at large.

Resolved, That this Meeting feels great mortification that the House of Commons (notwithstanding the Resignation of his Royal Highness the Commander in Chief), did not place upon their Journals some Resolution that should have recorded their sense of his misconduct, and which might have been handed down to posterity as a valuable lesson of reproof; and that this Meeting cannot fail to observe, that the conduct of the Majority of the House of Commons during the whole of the late proceedings, has but added one more to the many instances that might be adduced, in which similar Majorities appear to have acted under an influence directly opposed to the feelings and opinions of the People.

Resolved, That it is the opinion of this Meeting, that the Representatives who cease to feel a common interest with the people on the subject of abuses, can afford no security to the people against the increase of those abuses; and that therefore

the only effectual remedy which can be applied to so great and alarming an evil, is such a Reform in the Election of Representatives as will enable them sufficiently to speak the sentiments of the people.

Resolved unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to Thomas Kemp and Henry Shelley, esquires, the Independent Representatives of this Independent Borough, for their steady and uniform conduct in voting in the Minority upon each motion, that tended to censure his Royal Highness the Commander in Chief.

Resolved unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be also given to sir F. Burdett, bart., the Seconder; to lord Folkestone, Mr. Whitbread, sir S. Romilly, adm. Markham, gen. Ferguson, Mr. H. Martin, Mr. Coke, and Mr. C. W. Wynne, who so ably supported it; to those Members who represent places in this county, and the rest of the 125 Representatives who formed the Independent Minority on the important question produced by Mr. Wardle's motion.

Resolved unanimously, That the Constables be requested to transmit a copy of these Resolutions to G. L. Wardle, Thos. Kemp, and Henry Shelley, esquires.

Borough of READING.

At a very numerous and respectable Meeting of the Inhabitants of this Borough, convened by the Worshipful Thomas Gleed, esq., Mayor of the said Borough, in pursuance of a Requisition to consider of the corrupt practices lately proved in the House of Commons, and holden in the Town-hall the 19th instant, the twelve following Resolutions having been moved by J. B. Monck, esq., and seconded by H. Marsh, esq., were carried as follows:

1st, Resolved unanimously, That corrupt practices have been found to exist in the grant of Commissions and Appointments in the Army, no less disgraceful to the character of the late Commander in Chief as a Soldier, than ruinous to the Public Service.

2ndly, Unanimously, That G. L. Wardle, esq., is entitled to the Thanks of his Country, for the zeal, integrity and intrepidity, with which he maintained the Charges of Corruption brought against his Royal Highness the Duke of York, in spite of the luke-warmness of the leading Members of Opposition, and the open hostility and direct menaces of Ministers.

3rdly, (With only one Dissentient), That Charles Shaw Lefevre, esq., one of the Representatives for this Borough, has deserved well of his Constituents, and conferred honour on their choice, by the plain, intelligible, independent, consistent, decisive manner in which he acted and voted during the whole course of the late Inquiry.

4th, Unanimously, That our Thanks are due to sir F. Burdett, bart., who seconded Mr. Wardle; lord visc. Folkestone; sir S. Romilly, knt.; S. Whitbread, esq.; adm. Markham; the gallant gen. Ferguson, and the remainder of the 125 Members who supported Mr. Wardle's Motion.

5th, (With only three Dissentients), That the Vote of the House of Commons upon the Motion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the Acquittal of his Royal Highness the Duke of York, from all knowledge of the corrupt practices proved, hath done violence both to the understanding and feelings of Englishmen, and affords a prominent and striking example of the very imperfect Representation of the People.

6th, Unanimously, That the only effectual barrier against the inroads of Corruption is to be found in the constitutional resort to obtain a fair and faithful Representation of the People in their House of Commons.

7th, (With only one Dissentient), That the number of Placemen and Pensioners having seats in the House of Commons is a growing evil, contrary to an antient Resolution of that House, destructive of the Independence of Parliament, and that the number ought to be restricted to certain Officers of State, whose presence may be expedient in the House of Commons.

8th, Unanimously, That the state of the decayed Boroughs in the United Kingdom, returning Members to Parliament, and which have become by lapse of time the private property of individuals, is one great cause of the present wide extending deplorable Corruption, and demands the serious attention of Parliament, as a mockery of Representation.

9th, (With only three Dissentients), That the restoration of triennial Parliaments agreeable to the Statute 6th William and Mary, would greatly check Corruption, and in the words of the Preamble to that memorable Act, would "tend very "much to the happy union and good "agreement of the King and People."

10th, Unanimously, That the only way to have independent men in Parliament, is to send them independent there, and that the example set by Westminster

in the manner of electing sir F. Burdett, cannot be too highly commended, and is worthy to be imitated by all the free Boroughs throughout the Kingdom.

11th, (With only three Dissentients), That during the present reign every successive Administration has yielded either to the force or to the temptation of the present system of Corruption, and the result of every change has been to hold the People in delusion, and not to remove, but perpetuate Abuses.

12th, (With only five Dissentients), That we have no hopes that his Majesty's present Ministers will ever seriously and earnestly take in hand the work of Reformation, as the late proceedings in Parliament have fully proved them to be the Ministers of the Crown only, and not of the People—the Stiflers of Inquiry and the Abettors of Corruption.

A Resolution being then put by the Rev. Dr. Valpy, and seconded by Rob. Harris, esq.; that the vote of John Simeon, esq.; one of the Representatives of this Borough, in favour of Mr. Bankes's Motion, is highly deserving of the thanks of his Constituents —was négatived by a great Majority.

A Resolution was then proposed by the rev. Dr. Valpy, and seconded by Thomas Ring, esq., "That in order to set the example of Purity of Representation, it is unfit for any Elector of this Borough to accept a Public Dinner or any other Gratuity, directly or indirectly, from his Representatives," which was carried without opposition.

TOWN OF KINGSTON-UPON HULL.

At a Meeting of the Inhabitants of the Town and Neighbourhood of Kingston-upon Hull, held at the Guild-hall there on Wednesday, the 19th instant, for the purpose of expressing their public Opinion of the Transactions which have recently passed in the House of Commons, and to consider of a Vote of Thanks to Mr. Wardle, (along with the other Members who supported him) for the manly intrepidity and perseverance displayed by him in instituting and prosecuting his charges against the conduct of the Ex-Commander in Chief.—Andrew Hollingworth, esq. Mayor, in the chair.

Resolved unanimously,

That it is the duty of this Meeting to express their detestation of the corrupt practices proved to exist in the Military Administration of the country, and in various other departments of Government.

That G. L. Wardle, esq. by his intrepidity in preferring charges of corruption against his Royal Highness the late Commander-in-Chief, and by his ability and perseverance in establishing the same, is eminently entitled to the Thanks of this Meeting, and to the everlasting gratitude of his country.

That the Thanks of this Meeting are also due to lord visc. Mahon and John Staniforth, esq. our Representatives in Parliament, to Tho. Thompson, esq. our fellow townsman, and to lord visc. Milton, and William Wilberforce, esq. the Representatives for the County of York, together with the rest of the Independent Minority, for their votes and exertions on this occasion.

That this Meeting, seeing the shameful venality that prevails in the different departments of the State, and also as has been recently evinced, in the disposal of East India patronage, feels it a duty to state their conviction of the necessity of a complete Change of public measures, of the Abolition of Reversionary Grants and unmerited Pensions and Sinecure Places, and of the Restoration of the Purity of Parliament, according to the genuine principles of the Constitution.

That the Chairman be requested to sign these Resolutions as the act of this Meeting, and to transmit copies thereof to Mr. Wardle, lord Mahon, Mr. Staniforth, Mr. Thompson, lord Milton, and Mr. Wilberforce.

BOROUGH OF STAFFORD.

At a General Meeting of the Inhabitants of this Borough, convened by public advertisement, April 20th, the following Address was unanimously voted to G. L. Wardle, esq.

"To G. L. Wardle, esq.—We the Inhabitants of the Borough of Stafford, have witnessed with sentiments of admiration and gratitude, the firm but temperate manner, in which you have prosecuted a long and laborious inquiry into the conduct of the late Commander in Chief.—The victory which you have obtained over the abuses disclosed in that high official situation, is a noble instance of the self-renovating power of our glorious constitution.—You have shewn, that any virtuous and independent Member of the House of Commons, unconnected with party, but supported by the public voice, is enabled to promote the cause of truth and the real interests of the nation.—Estimating your services therefore as the efforts of an honest and courageous mind, we offer to you

our ardent thanks, as a part of that community which you have so eminently benefited.

Resolved, that a copy of this Address, signed by the Chairman, be transmitted by him to G. L. Wardle, esq.

TOWN AND COUNTY OF POOLE.

At a Meeting of the Inhabitants of the Town and County of Poole, pursuant to Public Notice, held at the Town Hall, on Friday, the 21st of April, 1809, Thomas Parr, in the Chair.

Resolved, That the exposure of many transactions in the several Departments of the State, and the conduct of many persons connected therewith, are so many melancholy proofs that the Constitution of the Country has been endangered by gross and scandalous corruption.

That it is the indispensible duty of every Member of the House of Commons, to guard with a watchful eye the expenditure of the public money; and as the faithful guardian of the People's rights, to exert every endeavour to detect, and bring to condign punishment, the Agents of Corruption in every Department of the State.

That it is to the true patriotism and undaunted zeal of G. L. Wardle, esq. that the Country is indebted for the exposure of many flagrant abuses in the Military Department; and to his unexampled courage and perseverance, (assisted by the virtuous and independent Members of the House of Commons) we look with confidence to the completion of the great work of Reformation. Deeply impressed with these sentiments, we cannot but consider G. L. Wardle, esq. intitled not only to our warmest Thanks, but also to the gratitude of his country.

That the Thanks of this Meeting be conveyed to G. L. Wardle, esq. accordingly.

That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to B. Lester Lester, esq. the worthy Representative of this Town and County; to the Member for the County of Dorset, and to all other the Members of the House of Commons who voted in the different Minorities on the late important questions.

TOWN OF MAIDSTONE.

At a Meeting of the Inhabitants of this Town, held at the Court Hall, pursuant to public notice, April 21, James Smyth, esq. in the Chair, The following Resolutions were entered into:—

1. Resolved unanimously, That the late Inquiry by the House of Commons into the Conduct of his Royal Highness the Duke of York, as Commander-in-Chief, has exposed the most flagrant abuses in the Administration of Public Affairs, which tend to stain the honour of the British character and endanger the security of the En[illegible].

2. Unanimously, That impressed with a deep sense of the service he has rendered his country, the Thanks of this Meeting be given to G. L. Wardle, esq. for that diligent perseverance and temperate, but manly spirit, with which, undismayed by the menaces of power, or unsupported by the intrigues of party, he has brought into public view a system of corruption, equally dangerous to the Liberties of the People, and the Safety of the Crown.

3. Unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to sir F. Burdett, bart. for having seconded Mr. Wardle's Motion.

4. Unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be presented to Geo. Longman, esq. our worthy Representative, for the faithful discharge of his public trust, in opposing abuse and corruption by dividing in favour of Mr. Wardle's Motion.

5. Unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to lord Folkestone, W. Honywood, esq. S. Whitbread, esq. sir S. Romilly, knt. gen. Ferguson, J. Calcraft, esq. J. Jackson, esq. and the rest of the 125 Honest Members, who voted for Mr. Wardle's Motion.

6. Unanimously, That the decision of the Majority of the House of Commons on the Abuses brought to light in the course of the late Inquiry, is a subject of deep regret and concern to the People of England, and must impress conviction on the mind of every Friend to his King and Country that a radical Reform in the Representation of the People presents the only effectual means of putting a stop to those corrupt practices which undermine and threaten to destroy our envied Constitution.

7. With three dissentient voices, That this Hall is gratified to hear that the respectable names of sir Wm. Geary, bart. T. Law Hodges, esq. and T. Rider, esq. are given to a Meeting, called for the express purpose of digesting a plan of a Reform in Parliament, and we trust that their efforts will conduce to the satisfaction of the People, and the welfare of the Country.

Borough of PLYMOUTH.

At a very numerous and respectable Meeting of the Inhabitants of the Borough of Plymouth, convened at the Guildhall thereof this 24th day of April, 1809, by public Advertisement, by the Worshipful the Mayor, to consider the propriety of a Vote of Thanks to Mr. Wardle, for his exemplary and judicious arrangements, in a recent Investigation before Parliament respecting the Conduct of the late Commander in Chief of the Army.—The Worshipful the Mayor in the Chair.

Resolved, That circumstances of public notoriety place beyond all doubt the long existence of nefarious and scandalous Abuses in various Branches of the Government of the Country, and that minute Investigation is absolutely necessary into several Public Departments,

Resolved, That G. L. Wardle, esq. has faithfully discharged the duties of a conscientious Member of Parliament, and is eminently entitled to the approbation and thanks of the Inhabitants of this Town, for the firm and manly manner and distinguished abilities evinced by him on the Inquiry into the Conduct of the late Commander in Chief of the Army; and also that great praise is due to all those who supported him in his arduous and difficult undertaking.

Resolved, That the Inhabitants of this Town regret that a much greater number of independent and unbiassed Members were not to be found in the House of Commons anxious to promote such measures as might tend to annihilate Corruption, which if not corrected must endanger the welfare of our inestimable and happy Constitution.

Resolved, That the Mayor be requested to communicate to G. L. Wardle, esq. the Sentiments and Resolutions of this Meeting.

City of COVENTRY.

At a Meeting of the Inhabitants of this City, held at the County Hall, the 25th day of April, 1809, pursuant to notice given by Basil Goode, esq. Mayor, in consequence of a Requisition sent to him, for the purpose of expressing their sentiments upon the late Investigation of the Conduct of his Royal Highness the Duke of York, before the House of Commons; which was as respectably and numerously attended as any Public Meeting ever witnessed in that Hall.—Samuel Whitwell, esq. in the Chair.

After some preliminary observations, from several Gentlemen, explanatory of the nature and design of the Meeting, the following Resolutions were passed without one dissenting voice:

1. That it is the opinion of this Meeting, that corrupt abuses appear to have existed to an alarming extent, in different departments of the State, and particularly in that of the Army, as clearly substantiated by the evidence produced before the House of Commons, in the Investigation of the Conduct of his Royal Highness the Duke of York, the late Commander in Chief.

2. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to G. L. Wardle, esq. M. P. for his intrepid and patriotic conduct in bringing forward the Charges before the House of Commons, and for his laudable and persevering exertions, in the face of the most powerful opposition, during the progress of this arduous business.

3. That the Thanks of this Meeting be also given to our worthy Representatives, Peter Moore, esq. and William Mills, esq. for their independent conduct during this important Investigation, and for which they are justly entitled to the additional approbation and confidence of their Constituents.

4. That the Thanks of this Meeting be also given to sir Francis Burdett, bart. M.P. lord visc. Folkestone, M. P. Samuel Whitbread, esq. M. P. sir Samuel Romilly, knt. M. P. major-general Ferguson, M. P. Harvey Christian Combe, esq. M. P. and all the rest of the virtuous and honourable Minorities, who nobly stood forth at this important crisis as the enemies of corruption and the friends of their country, by supporting Mr. Wardle upon this occasion.

5. That this Meeting consider the conduct of the present administration, relative to the late Inquiry respecting his Royal Highness the Duke of York, derogatory to their official duty, and renders them altogether undeserving that great trust with which they are invested.

6. That a Committee be appointed to carry these Resolutions into effect, and that it consist of those Gentlemen who signed the Requisition.

(To be continued.)

LONDON:—Printed by T. C. HANSARD, Peterborough-Court, Fleet-Street;
Published by R. BAGSHAW, Brydges-Street, Covent-Garden:—Sold also by J. BUDD, Pall-Mall.